



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,053	05/11/2006	Zvi Barak	CB3-2559-US	1390

35650 7590 05/26/2010  
HENRY M. SINAI  
(IP-PARTNERSHIP)  
P.O. BOX 669  
RAANANA, 43350  
ISRAEL

EXAMINER
----------

ZENATI, AMAL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/26/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/579,053	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BARAK, ZVI	
	<b>Examiner</b> AMAL ZENATI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 16 recites both the limitation “the time period” and “the recurrence interval” There are insufficient antecedent basis for these limitation in the claim.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Consider **Claims 1 - 6**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gilbert** (US Patent No.: 7,580,374 B1; hereinafter **Gilbert**) in view of **Spencer** (Pub. No.: US 2002/0184624 A1; hereinafter **Spencer**)

Consider **claim 1, Gilbert** clearly shows and discloses a system for a directing party to simultaneously communicate with a plurality of participants comprising: a control unit directly controlled by the directing party (col. 3, lines 15-66; fig. 1 and fig. 6); a first server in remote communication with said control unit; a second dialing server in communication with said first server, the second dialing server being configured to communicate with the plurality of participants in real-time (*the servers being one server or two separate servers would carry no patentable weight since it is a matter of engineering choice and it would be obvious modifications to one of ordinary skill in the art*) (col. 4, lines 1-66; col. 6, lines 1-25; and fig. 6); wherein said directing party controls the communication with the plurality of participants (col. 5, lines 35-67; and figs. 2-7); however, **Gilbert** does not specifically disclose the system, wherein dialing server being configured to simultaneously communicate with the plurality of participants (dialing all the numbers at the same time).

In the same field of endeavor, **Spencer** clearly discloses the method, wherein dialing server being configured to simultaneously communicate with the plurality of participants (paragraphs: 0043).

**Spencer** discloses the above for the purpose of providing users means to communicate with all the plurality of participants simultaneously (paragraphs: 0024 and 0025).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to simultaneously communicate with the plurality of participants as taught by Spencer in Gilbert, in order to provide users means to communicate with all the plurality of participants simultaneously.

Consider **claim 2, Gilbert and Spencer** clearly show the method, wherein said control unit communicates with said first server via the Internet (Gilbert: col. 5, lines 60-67).

Consider **claim 3, Gilbert and Spencer** clearly show the method, wherein said first server and said second dialing server are combined in a single unit (Gilbert: figs. 1-2)

Consider **claim 4, Gilbert and Spencer** clearly show the method, wherein said second dialing server communicates with the plurality of participants via a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) to any of a group of communication devices associated with the participants including land line telephones, personal computers, cellular telephones, facsimile machines, and cable TV (Gilbert: fig. 1; and Spencer: paragraph 0017).

Consider **claim 5, Gilbert and Spencer** clearly show the method, wherein said dialing server is configured to communicate with any combination of participants and communication devices via any of a group of communication protocols including interactive television, cable or satellite (Spencer: paragraph 0017).

Consider **claim 6, Gilbert and Spencer** clearly show the method, wherein said first server comprises a scheduler for allocating time slots available for communication via said second dialing server (Gilbert: col. 8, lines 40-60).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 7 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by **Spencer (Pub. No.: US 2002/0184624 A1; hereinafter Spencer)**

Consider **claim 7, Spencer** clearly shows and discloses a method for communicating with a plurality of participants, said method comprising the step of: a directing party independently controlling

Art Unit: 2614

the simultaneous communication with the plurality of participants in real-time (abstract, paragraphs: 0017-0020, 0024, and 0043).

Consider **claim 10, Spencer** clearly show the method, wherein said simultaneous communication comprises any of a group of services including polling consumer surveys, sending messages, sending alerts and conducting interviews (paragraphs: 0017-0020, 0024, and 0043-0044).

7. Consider **Claims 8 - 9, 16, and 23 - 26**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Spencer (Pub. No.: US 2002/0184624 A1; hereinafter Spencer)** in view of **Bezar (Pub. No.: US 2004/0093218 A1; hereinafter Bezar)**

Consider **claim 8, Spencer** clearly discloses the claimed invention above and the step of independently controlling comprises the steps of: initiating the simultaneous communication; but lack teaching the method, wherein analyzing the responses of the plurality of participants to said simultaneous communication.

In the same field of endeavor, **Bezar** clearly discloses shows the method the method, wherein analyzing the responses of the plurality of participants to said simultaneous communication (paragraph: 00116 and 0033 - 0035).

**Bezar** discloses the above for the purpose of analyzing and recording the participants' speech parameters and send it back to the caller (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to analyze the responses of the plurality of participants as taught by Bezar in Spencer, in order to send the analyzing and recording participants' speech parameters to the caller.

Consider **claim 9, Spencer and Bezar** clearly show the method, wherein said step of independently controlling comprises the step of: terminating the simultaneous communication after an

Art Unit: 2614

analysis of the responses from a percentage of the plurality of participants (Bezar: paragraphs: 0044-0048; and 0052-0054).

Consider **claim 16, Spencer and Bezar** clearly show the method, wherein said step of initiating comprises the steps of: defining the time period to be associated with the communication; and defining the recurrence interval of the communication (Spencer; 0025-0032).

Consider **claim 23, Spencer and Bezar** clearly show the method, wherein said step of analyzing the responses comprises the steps of: analyzing the participants input; preparing a report; and transmitting the report in real time to the directing party (Bezar: paragraphs: 0044-0048)

Consider **claim 24, Spencer and Bezar** clearly show the method, wherein said report may comprise any of a group of reporting formats including lists, graphs and charts (Bezar: paragraphs: 0044-0054).

Consider **claim 25, Spencer and Bezar** clearly show the method, wherein said step of initiating comprises the steps of allocating a time slot for a plurality of callers to dial a dedicated number; preparing and recording a script; and playing said script to said plurality of callers (Bezar: paragraphs: 0044-0051)

Consider **claim 26, Spencer and Bezar** clearly show the method, wherein said step of initiating comprises the step of permitting the plurality of callers to transfer to a human resource for specific interactive discussions (Bezar: paragraphs: 0044-0048 and 0057).

8. Consider **Claims 11 - 15**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Spencer (Pub. No.: US 2002/0184624 A1; hereinafter Spencer)** in view of **Bezar (Pub. No.: US 2004/0093218 A1; hereinafter Bezar)** and further in view of **Strauss et al (patent No.: 5,940,598; hereinafter Strauss)**

Consider **claim 11, Spencer and Bezar** clearly show the method, wherein said step of initiating comprises the steps of: preparing a distribution list associated with said plurality of participants; constructing a script associated with the type of communication being conducted; and distributing the script to the filtered distribution list (*filtering said distribution list in accordance with the type of communication being conducted is inherent in Spencer and Bezar, however, Examiner use Strauss for more clarification*) (Spencer: paragraphs: 0017-0021; and Bezar: paragraphs: 0033-0035, and 0050-0051); however, **Spencer and Bezar** does not specifically disclose filtering said distribution list in accordance with the type of communication being conducted

In the same field of endeavor, **Strauss** clearly discloses the method, filtering said distribution list in accordance with the type of communication being conducted (figs. 5A-5D).

**Strauss** discloses the above for the purpose of providing multimode communications via a combination of the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and public packet data network (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to filter said distribution list in accordance with the type of communication being conducted as taught by Strauss in Spencer and Bezar, in order to provide multimode communications via a combination of the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and public packet data network.

Consider **claim 12, Spencer, Bezar, and Strauss** clearly show the method, wherein said distribution list comprises any of a group of lists including telephone numbers, email addresses, account numbers and cable IDs (Bezar: paragraph 0050; and Spencer; 0017).

Consider **claim 13, Spencer, Bezar, and Strauss** clearly show and discloses the method, wherein said step of constructing a script comprises the step of defining and recording any of a group of elements including messages, questions and possible alternative answers to said questions (Bezar: paragraph 0050; and Spencer; 0017).



Consider **claim 14, Spencer, Bezar, and Strauss** clearly show the method, wherein said step of constructing a script comprises the step of permitting the plurality of participants to transfer to a human resource for specific interactive discussions (Bezar: paragraph 0048-0051; and Spencer; 0019-0024).

Consider **claim 15, Spencer, Bezar, and Strauss** clearly show the method, wherein said step of defining and recording comprises the step of allowing the plurality of participants to submit their responses to said questions in any of a group of communication methods including DTMF, SMS, voice and via interactive television (Bezar: paragraph 0048-0051; and 0053-0057)

9. Consider **Claims 17 - 22**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Spencer (Pub. No.: US 2002/0184624 A1; hereinafter Spencer)** in view of **Penfield et al (Patent No.: US 6,480,591 B1; hereinafter Penfield)** and further in view of **Dorenbosch et al (Pub. No.: US 2004/0064355 A1; hereinafter Dorenbosch)**

Consider **claim 17, Spencer** clearly discloses the claimed invention above but lack teaching the method, further comprising the step of determining the availability and cost of the service to be provided.

In the same field of endeavor, **Penfield** clearly discloses shows the method the method, further comprising the step of determining cost of the service to be provided (abstract, col. 1, lines 55-66; and col. 2, lines 1-30).

**Penfield** discloses the above for the purpose of determining cost of the service to be provided (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determining cost of the service to be provided as taught by Penfield in Spencer, in order to determine cost of the service to be provided.

However, **Spencer and Penfield** lack teaching the method, further comprising the step of determining the availability of the service to be provided.

In the same field of endeavor, **Dorenbosch** clearly discloses shows the method the method, further comprising the step of determining availability of the service to be provided (abstract, paragraphs: 0014-0017).

**Dorenbosch** discloses the above for the purpose of determining availability of the service to be provided (abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determining availability of the service to be provided as taught by Dorenbosch in Spencer and Penfield, in order to determine availability of the service to be provided.

Consider **claim 18, Spencer, Penfield, and Dorenbosch** clearly show the method, wherein said step of determining comprises the steps of: determining the telephony resources available; calculating the length of each call; and determining the number of telephones required for the service, based on the length of each call and the size of the distribution list (Penfield: col. 4, lines 16-45; and Dorenbosch: paragraphs: 0014-0019).

Consider **claim 19, Spencer, Penfield, and Dorenbosch** clearly shows the method, wherein said step of determining comprises the step of: the directing party allocating a level of priority to the communication (Dorenbosch: paragraphs: 0016-0017).

Consider **claim 20, Spencer, Penfield, and Dorenbosch** clearly show the method, wherein said step of determining further comprising the steps of the system denying the service due to shortage of resources available at the time period requested; and the directing party rescheduling the time period for the communication in accordance with the telephony resources available and level of priority (Penfield: col. 4, lines 16-45; and col. 6, lines 22-45; and Dorenbosch: paragraphs: 0014-0019).

Consider **claim 21, Spencer, Penfield, and Dorenbosch** clearly show the method, wherein said step of determining comprises the step of: comparing the cost of the communication with the credit

Art Unit: 2614

available to the client (Penfield: col. 1, lines 28-35; col. 6, lines 22-45; and Dorenbosch: paragraphs: 0014-0019)

Consider **claim 22, Spencer, Penfield, and Dorenbosch** clearly shows the method, wherein said step of determining further comprises the step of: requesting additional credit to cover the cost of the communication or denying the service if not enough credit is available (Penfield: col. 4, lines 16-45; and col. 6, lines 22-45).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amal Zenati whose telephone number is 571-270-1947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571- 272- 7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571- 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/CURTIS KUNTZ/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Amal Zenati/  
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Application/Control Number: 10/579,053

Page 11

Art Unit: 2614

May 22, 2010